

Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending, while claims 7, 9-14, 21, and 23-28 stand withdrawn. Claims 1-6 and 15-20 are rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1-6 and 15-20.

Claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 4,912,805 (Krasznai et al.) in view of Great Britain Patent 2,041,741 (Stubbs). Inasmuch as the rejection applies to the claims as amended, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 15 require at least one row of bristle tufts disposed on the brushroll body. The at least one row of bristle tufts comprise a first tuft of a first effective length from the brushroll body and at least a second tuft of a second effective length that is different from the first effective length. The first tuft is oriented at a first angle with respect to a radius direction of the brushroll body and the second tuft is oriented at a second angle.

Krasznai does not disclose a first bristle tuft at a first angle from a radius direction and a second bristle tuft at a second angle. In contrast, Krasznai only discloses radially oriented bristle tufts. Krasznai does not disclose even a single angled bristle tuft.

Stubbs does not disclose a row of bristle tufts including first tufts and second tufts, with a first tuft being oriented at a first angle and a second tuft being oriented at a second angle. Instead, FIG. 3 of Stubbs shows two rows 2 of tufts. All of the tufts of each row 2 are angled. The combination of Krasznai and Stubbs therefore does not produce claims 1 and 15 of the present invention.

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that “[t]here must be some reason, suggestion, or motivation found in the prior art whereby a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention would make the combination. That knowledge can not come from the applicant’s invention itself.” In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (emphasis added). There is no motivation to combine Krasznai and Stubbs.

Independent claims 1 and 15 therefore include features that are neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited references. Claims 2-3, 6, 16-17, and 20 are allowable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15.

Claims 4 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Krasznai and Stubbs and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,459,007 (Taylor). Claims 4 and 18 depend from independent claims 1 and 15 and therefore are patentable for the reasons previously discussed.

Claims 5 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Krasznai and Stubbs and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,188,673 (Newman). Claims 5 and 19 depend from independent claims 1 and 15 and therefore are patentable for the reasons previously discussed.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-6 and 15-20.

Please feel free to call me to discuss the patentability of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

4/10/07



Gregg Jansen, Reg. No. 46,799

The Ollila Law Group LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999, ext. 14

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 32847